

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_89477
Title of the Manuscript:	A 5-YEAR REVIEW OF INCIDENCE, PRESENTATION AND MANAGEMENT OF BARTHOLIN GLAND CYSTS AND ABSCESES IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL, YENAGOA, SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Not clear, why this paragraph 5 repeatedly used reference number 11. It does not flow well. have punctuation error throughout your document please see it well; you should correct it. Your paper needs some substantial grammar editing. Even font type is not coherent thought manuscripts. Full stop are most of I see are before reference that should be rewrite. There were 2,478 gynecological cases managed in our Centre; out of which there were 26 cases of Bartholin cyst and abscess, giving an incidence of 1.05%. researcher reviewed 2,458 cases but under data presentation I see 26 results how please describe in exclusion of others under methodology Sample size, sampling procedure, inclusion and exclusion of patient's chart should be expressed under methodology.	
Minor REVISION comments	Result summary does not highlight interesting descriptive findings. Most of the findings summarized here are not interesting and easily found from any surveys recommend the stakeholders based on your investigation	
Optional/General comments	Tables and graphs should be standard form	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bargude Balta
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia